

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,805	07/12/2006	Tominaga Koji	FUJ0001US	3990
23413 CANTOR CO	7590 12/20/201 LBURN LLP	0	EXAMINER LUKE, DANIEL M	
20 Church Stre				
22nd Floor Hartford, CT (	06103		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, -			2813	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/20/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail  $\,$  address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/550,805	KOJI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DANIEL LUKE	2813	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 November 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on; (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 706,07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee d.

nave over men is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the feet. The appropriate extension less under 37 GFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed,
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filled within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
AMENDMENTS
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because         (a)</li></ol>
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
<ul> <li>4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</li> <li>5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected:
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 OFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. Other: .

/Matthew C. Landau/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2813

/D. L./ Examiner, Art Unit 2813 Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are based on the criticality of the claimed range of the thickness of the partial insulating films. However, Applicant has not met the requirements for demonstrating the criticality of a claimed range as it is described in the MPEP.

Section 716.02(e) of the MPEP states that "An affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 must compare the claimed subject matter with the closest prior art to be effective to rebut a prima facile case of obviousness, In re Burckel, 592 F.2d 1175, 201 USPQ 67 (CCPA 1979)." Applicant has failed to provide such an affidavit or declaration.

Furthermore, Applicant has the burden of establishing that the results are unexpected and significant. Section 716.02(b) I states "The evidence relied upon should establish that the differences in results are in fact unexpected and unobvious and of botalstistical and practical significance." Ex parte Gelles, 22 USPC2d 1318, 1319 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992)". Applicant has not met this burden.